

**STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

---

Appeal from Florence County  
Court of Common Pleas  
D. Craig Brown, Circuit Court Judge

Case No.: 2016-CP-21-1831  
Appeal No.: 2018-001016

**RECEIVED**

DEC 20 2018

SC Court of Appeals

---

Isabelle  
MacKenzie.....Appellant/Respondent,

v.

C&B Logging and Charles Brandon  
Barr.....Respondents/Appellants.

---

**INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT/RESPONDENT**

---

ANASTOPOULO LAW FIRM, LLC  
J. Camden Hodge (SC #100638)  
Eric M. Poulin (SC #100209)  
Roy T. Willey, IV (SC #101010)  
32 Ann Street  
Charleston, South Carolina 29403  
Phone (843) 614-8888  
Facsimile (843) 494-5536

**Attorneys for the Appellant/Respondent Isabelle  
MacKenzie**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....3

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL.....4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....5,6

STATEMENT OF FACTS.....6,7

STANDARD OF REVIEW.....7

ARGUMENT.....8-12

    I.    The Circuit Court Erred in Refusing to Admit Evidence of Defendant Barr’s  
          Criminal History to Prove Plaintiff’s Claims for Negligent Hiring, Training,  
          Supervision, and Entrustment and Impose Punitive Damages Against Defendant  
          C&B Logging, LLC.....8

          A. Mr. Barr’s Criminal History was Relevant to Proving Plaintiff’s  
          Causes of Action Against C&B Logging, LLC and Punitive Damages,  
          and the Probative Value of Said Evidence was not Outweighed by  
          Potential Prejudice to the Defendant.....8 – 12

CONCLUSION.....12

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

*Green v. Hewett*,  
305 S.C. 238, 407 S.E.2d 651 (1991).....9, 11

*James v. Kelly Trucking Co.*,  
377 S.C. 628, 661 S.E.2d 329 (2008).....8, 10, 11

*Kase v. Ebert*,  
392 S.C. 57, 707 S.E.2d 456 (2011).....8

*State v. Breeze*,  
379 S.C. 538, 665 S.E.2d 247 (Ct. App. 2008).....7

*State v. Kelley*,  
319 S.C. 173, 460 S.E.2d 368 (1995).....7

*State v. McDonald*,  
343 S.C. 319, 540 S.E.2d 464 (2000).....7

*State v. Saltz*,  
346 S.C. 114, 551 S.E.2d 240 (2001).....7

*Williams v. Preiss–Wal Pat III, LLC*,  
17 F.Supp.3d 528, 538 (D.S.C. 2014).....9

**OTHER RULES:**

Rule 403, SCRE.....10

**STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL**

- I. DID THE CIRCUIT COURT ERR IN REFUSING TO ADMIT EVIDENCE OF DEFENDANT CHARLES BRANDON BARR'S CRIMINAL INDICTMENTS AND PLEAS TO PROVE PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS FOR NEGLIGENT HIRING, TRAINING, SUPERVISION, AND ENTRUSTMENT AND IMPOSE PUNITIVE DAMAGES AGAINST C&B LOGGING, LLC?

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This matter arises out of a logging truck upon motorcycle accident that occurred on April 23, 2016 in Florence County, State of South Carolina. [Complaint]. According to an independent eyewitness, Appellant/Respondent Isabelle MacKenzie (“MacKenzie”) was traveling Southbound on her motorcycle when Charles Brandon Barr (“Mr. Barr”) allegedly was traveling in the wrong lane. [Tr. Trans. 436:15-19; 437:6-15; 437: 21 – 438:16]. The eyewitness testified that as Mr. Barr began to move the logging truck into the correct lane, Mr. Barr collided with a vehicle driven by Arthur Lee Gregg (“Gregg”). [*Id.* at 438:9 – 439:4]. Moments after the collision with Mr. Gregg, as Mr. Barr attempted to further move the logging truck into the correct lane, MacKenzie collided with the logging truck and sustained injuries. [*Id.* 436:15-19, 437:21 – 438:16; 438:9440:15].

MacKenzie thereafter filed a Summons and Complaint in the Florence County Court of Common Pleas against Mr. Barr, individually and as an employee/agent of C&B Logging, LLC, and C&B Logging LLC on August 4, 2016. [Complaint]. The matter was assigned case number 2016-CP-21-1831. *Id.* In her Complaint, MacKenzie alleged causes of action for negligence as against Mr. Barr, and negligence and negligent hiring, training, supervision, and entrustment against C&B Logging, LLC (the “employer”) *Id.* MacKenzie further prayed for punitive damages. *Id.* On August 26, 2016, Mr. Barr and C&B Logging, LLC filed their Answer, denying the material allegations of the Complaint. [Answer]. Mr. Barr and C&B Logging, LLC further asserted comparative negligence as an affirmative defense. *Id.*

The case came to trial on April 23, 2018 before the Honorable D. Craig Brown. During the trial of the case, MacKenzie sought to introduce into evidence and elicit testimony regarding Mr. Barr’s prior criminal convictions and history. (Tr. Trans. 97: 6 – 103:7; 258:9 – 271:19).

The circuit court denied MacKenzie's request to do so and she was barred from discussing those issues during the trial of the case. [*Id.* at 291:14 – 292:4].

On April 26, 2018, the jury issued a verdict finding that Mr. Barr was sixty (60) percent at fault and C&B Logging, LLC forty (40) percent at fault. [ROA \_\_]. The jury awarded MacKenzie \$179,678.49 in actual damages. *Id.* The jury declined to award punitive damages. *Id.*

On May 29, 2018, Mackenzie filed her Notice of Appeal. Mr. Barr and C&B Logging, LLC filed their notice of cross-appeal on June 1, 2018, and their amended notice of cross-appeal on June 7, 2018.

#### **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

On the night of April 23, 2016 Isabelle MacKenzie was traveling Southbound on SC-51 on her motorcycle. [Tr. Trans. 436:15-19; 437:6-15; 437:21 – 438:16]. Moments earlier, Brandon Barr, who was operating a logging truck owned by C&B Logging, LLC and traveling Northbound on SC-51, was involved in a collision with another driver, Mr. Gregg. [*Id.* at 438:9 – 439:4]. It is alleged that, at the time of the collision, Mr. Barr was in the incorrect lane. *Id.* MacKenzie alleges that just after the collision with Mr. Gregg, Mr. Barr began driving the logging truck from the left lane to the right lane. [*Id.* at 436:15-19; 437:6-15; 437:21 – 438:16]. It is MacKenzie's allegation and the testimony of the independent eye-witness that she then collided with the logging truck operated by Mr. Barr as the logging truck attempted to move into the correct lane. *Id.*

Mr. Barr has an extensive criminal history. [ROA \_\_; Tr. Trans. 258:11 – 271:20]. This includes, but is not limited to, an indictment for possession with intent to distribute marijuana and an indictment for possession with intent to distribute cocaine base. [ROA \_\_]. The

indictment for PWID cocaine base was pled down to a general conspiracy charge, and the indictment for PWID marijuana was pled down to possession of marijuana. [ROA \_\_ ]. MacKenzie sought to question Mr. Barr and, potentially, the corporate representative for C&B Logging, LLC, regarding said criminal indictments and pleas. [Tr. Trans. 97: 6 – 103:7; 258:9 – 271:19; 258:11 – 271:20] Notably, Plaintiff’s counsel sought to question the Defendants regarding the indictments and pleas for the purpose of proving her case for negligent supervision, retention, hiring, and entrustment and imposing punitive damages. [Tr. Trans. 291: 14 – 292: 4].

The circuit court denied Plaintiff’s request to admit the above criminal indictments and pleas into evidence or question Mr. Barr or a corporate representative of C&B Logging, LLC regarding the same. In doing so, the circuit court found that the probative value as it relates to those criminal matters was outweighed by the prejudicial effect, particularly when they were not to be used for impeachment purposes. [Tr. Trans. 291: 14 – 292: 4].

### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

“The admission or exclusion of evidence is left to the sound discretion of the trial judge, whose decision will not be reversed on appeal absent an abuse of discretion.” *State v. Saltz*, 346 S.C. 114, 121, 551 S.E.2d 240, 244 (2001). An abuse of discretion occurs when the conclusions of the trial court are based on an error of law. *State v. McDonald*, 343 S.C. 319, 325, 540 S.E.2d 464, 467 (2000). A trial judge has considerable latitude in ruling on the admissibility of evidence and his rulings will not be disturbed absent a showing of probable prejudice. *State v. Kelley*, 319 S.C. 173, 177, 460 S.E.2d 368, 370 (1995). The standard of review is limited to determining whether the trial court's ruling is supported by any evidence. *State v. Breeze*, 379 S.C. 538, 543, 665 S.E.2d 247, 250 (Ct. App. 2008).

## ARGUMENT

### I. THE CIRCUIT COURT ERRED IN REFUSING TO ADMIT EVIDENCE OF DEFENDANT BARR'S CRIMINAL HISTORY TO PROVE PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS FOR NEGLIGENT HIRING, TRAINING, SUPERVISION, AND ENTRUSTMENT AND IMPOSE PUNITIVE DAMAGES AGAINST DEFENDANT C&B LOGGING, LLC

Plaintiff brought causes of action against C&B Logging, LLC for negligence as well as negligent hiring, training, supervision, entrustment, and retention, and prayed for punitive damages. [Complaint]. As stated below, because Mr. Barr's criminal history was relevant to the above causes of action and to the issue of whether to impose punitive damages against C&B Logging, LLC, the circuit court committed reversible error by failing to allow the jury to consider that essential evidence.

#### A. Mr. Barr's Criminal History was Relevant to Proving Plaintiff's Causes of Action Against C&B Logging LLC and Punitive Damages, and the Probative Value of Said Evidence was not Outweighed by Potential Prejudice to the Defendant

"In circumstances where an employer knew or should have known that its employment of a specific person created an undue risk of harm to the public, a plaintiff may claim that the employer was itself negligent in hiring, supervising, or training the employee, or that the employer acted negligently in entrusting its employee with a tool that created an **unreasonable risk of harm to the public.**" *James v. Kelly Trucking Co.*, 377 S.C. 628, 631, 661 S.E.2d 329, 330 (2008)(emphasis added). Because these actions sound in negligence, the standard to be applied is one of ordinary care. *See id.* "Negligent hiring cases 'generally turn on two fundamental elements—knowledge of the employer and foreseeability of harm to third parties.'" *Kase v. Ebert*, 392 S.C. 57, 707 S.E.2d 456, 459 (2011) (quoting *Doe v. ATC, Inc.*, 367 S.C. 199, 624 S.E.2d 447, 450 (2005)). Put differently, the issue of an employer's knowledge concerns the employer's awareness that the employment of a specific individual created a risk of harm to the

public. *Williams v. Preiss–Wal Pat III, LLC*, 17 F.Supp.3d 528, 538 (D.S.C. 2014). Thus, to render a verdict on the negligent hiring, supervision, and training causes of action, the jury must determine what information the employer knew or should have known regarding the employee’s past conduct and actions. Without reviewing that evidence, a jury cannot wholly determine the risk of harm the employee presents to the public or judge the egregiousness of the employer’s action or inactions.

Here, the jury was entitled to hear only part of the story: a story that omitted Mr. Barr’s criminal history and instead contained only a smattering of his numerous driving infractions. The circuit court took away from the jury essential evidence regarding how C&B Logging, LLC created an unreasonable risk of harm to the public by putting Mr. Barr behind the wheel of a logging truck.

*Green v. Hewett* is instructive. 305 S.C. 238, 407 S.E.2d 651 (1991). In *Green*, the trial court excluded testimony that the adverse driver was convicted of trafficking marijuana in 1983 as being unduly prejudicial in his trial regarding the motor vehicle collision. The collision occurred in 1991. *Id.*, 407 S.E.2d at 652. The South Carolina Supreme Court deemed the trial court’s decision reversible error because the adverse driver’s prior crime was a “breach of [his] duty to his fellow man and society as a whole.” *Id.* The fact that the case was decided when South Carolina courts were tasked with determining which crimes constituted those of “moral turpitude” does not render *Green* inapplicable to the present matter. Indeed, *Green* stands in part for the proposition that the driver’s crime of trafficking marijuana harmed not only the public (as is required to prove a claim of negligent hiring, supervision, or training), but harmed society as a whole. *Id.* at 652-53. Moreover, the harm to society and the public was *one single instance* of

trafficking drugs – an incident that happened nearly eight (8) years prior to the collision that was the subject of the civil action. *Id.* at 652.

Here, Mr. Barr’s drug-related offenses were not so remote in time, but instead occurred in 2011 and 2012, and during the period in which he was employed by C&B Logging, LLC. [ROA \_\_\_; Tr. Trans. 258:11 – 271:20]. Without having the ability to view exactly what kind of unreasonable danger C&B Logging, LLC unleashed upon the public by allowing Mr. Barr to drive a 60,000 pound logging truck despite having convictions that harmed society as a whole, the jury was unable to properly apportion liability or determine whether to impose punitive damages upon the employer. Instead, the jury only was allowed to consider selected driving infractions Mr. Barr incurred.

The circuit court based its decision to exclude Mr. Barr’s criminal convictions and charges on Rule 403, SCRE. Specifically, the circuit court ruled that those charges are “more clearly prejudicial than probative.” [Tr. Trans. 291:15 – 292: 4]. When read in conjunction with *Green, supra*, the case of *James v. Kelly Trucking Co.* shows the circuit court’s decision to be error. In *James*, the defendant argued that public policy precluded the pursuit of an independent negligent hiring, training, supervision, or entrustment claim against an employer when the employer admits vicarious liability. *James*, 661 S.E.2d at 331. Defendant was concerned that a plaintiff pursuing those causes of action would be allowed to show a jury “highly prejudicial” evidence that would “lead to a jury verdict driven more by emotion than by law.” *Id.* Specifically, defendant worried that evidence such as “a prior driving record, **an arrest record**, or other records of past mishaps or misbehavior by the employee” would improperly inflame a South Carolina jury. *Id.* (emphasis added). The South Carolina Supreme Court disagreed, finding that such a paternalistic view of the law was improper, stating “the argument that an

independent cause of action against an employer must be precluded to protect the jury from considering prejudicial evidence presumes too much.” *Id.*

To be sure, when *James* and *Green* are taken together, it is clear that an arrest record regarding drug charges evidences a harm to the public and society – even when the criminal charges arose long before the subject motor vehicle collision and despite the fact that the criminal charges were unrelated to the cause of the collision. Moreover, *Green* shows that an eight (8) year old conviction for a drug related charge is **not** unduly prejudicial to a defendant in a civil action involving a motor vehicle collision. *Green*, 407 S.E.2d at 652

Here, there can be no doubt that the evidence MacKenzie sought to introduce would not lead to unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or mislead the jury. Instead, the excluded evidence would show the jury precisely how C&B Logging, LLC endangered the public: not by just putting a man with driving infractions behind the wheel, but by entrusting a dangerous instrumentality to a man whose criminal convictions could rightfully be considered a harm against society as a whole. Without being provided the benefit of such evidence, the jury could not accurately apportion fault to the employer. Moreover, the exclusion of said evidence deprived the jury of essential information that could have led to the imposition of punitive damages.

The circuit court further based its ruling partly on the proposition that *Green* stands for the tenet that the introduction of criminal offenses can be used only for the purposes of impeaching a witness. [Tr. Trans., 291:15 – 25]. In doing so, the circuit court failed to consider that whether or not Mr. Barr lied about his driving history was wholly immaterial to the fact that C&B Logging, LLC had a duty to the public to ensure its vehicles were operated in a safe manner by drivers that did not pose a threat to the public. The evidence MacKenzie sought to


admit went squarely to her causes of action for negligent hiring, training, supervision, and entrustment, as well as the imposition of punitive damages, and therefore was admissible.

**CONCLUSION**

For the reasons set forth herein, the Appellant/Respondent respectfully requests that this Court reverse the jury's verdict and remand for a new trial.

Respectfully submitted,

ANASTOPOULOU LAW FIRM, LLC



---

J. Camden Hodge (SC #100638)

Eric M. Poulin (SC #100209)

Roy T. Willey, IV (SC #101010)

32 Ann Street

Charleston, South Carolina 29403

Phone (843) 614-8888

Facsimile (843) 494-5536

**ATTORNEYS FOR  
APPELLANT/RESPONDENT**

December 18, 2018

Greenville, SC

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

DEC 20 2018

SC Court of Appeals

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from Florence County  
Court of Common Pleas  
D. Craig Brown, Circuit Court Judge

Case No.: 2016-CP-21-1831  
Appeal No.: 2018-001016

\_\_\_\_\_  
Isabelle  
MacKenzie.....Appellant/Respondent,


v.

C&B Logging and Charles Brandon  
Barr.....Respondents/Appellants.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**PROOF OF SERVICE**  
\_\_\_\_\_

I certify that I have served the enclosed Initial Brief of Appellant/Respondent and Designation of Matter to be Included in the Record on Appeal on December 18, 2018 by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid addressed to Respondents/Appellants' attorney of record, John P. Riordan. Copies of the same are provided via email.

[Signature Block on Following Page]



---

ANASTOPOULO LAW FIRM, LLC

J. Camden Hodge (SC #100638)

Eric M. Poulin (SC #100209)

Roy T. Willey, IV (SC #101010)

32 Ann Street

Charleston, South Carolina 29403

Phone (843) 614-8888

Facsimile (843) 494-5536

*Dated: December 18, 2018  
Greenville, SC*

**Attorneys for the Appellant/Respondent Isabelle  
MacKenzie**

Counsel of Record for Respondent:

John P. Riordan

Robert D. Moseley, Jr.

Megan M. Early-Soppa

2 West Washington Street, Suite 1100

Greenville, SC 29601

(864) 751-7638

TOLL FREE: 1 (800) 313-2546  
FACSIMILE: (843) 494-5536

REPLY TO ANN STREET OFFICE  
CAMDEN@AKIMLAWFIRM.COM

# ANASTOPOULO

---

## LAW FIRM

AKIM A. ANASTOPOULO (SC)  
ERIC M. POULIN (SC)(NC)(GA)(CA)  
ROY T. WILLEY, IV (SC)

JONATHAN N. ALKIS (SC)  
CONSTANCE ANASTOPOULO (SC)\*  
GUS ANASTOPOULO (SC)  
GARRETT L. BROWN (SC)  
KENNETH T. DAVID (SC)  
STEFAN B. FEIDLER (SC)(GA)  
HERB F. GLASS (SC)  
J. CAMDEN HODGE (SC)  
LANE D. JEFFERIES (SC)  
THOMAS D. KANDLER, II (NC)  
BYRON V. LEARY, II (SC)  
BENJAMIN W. LEE (SC)  
ALEXIS W. MCCUMBER (SC)  
MATTHEW L. NALL (SC)(KY)  
INDIA D. SHAW (DC)  
SAMANTHA SUTTON (SC)(NC)  
CASEY VAN VALKENBURGH (SC)(IL)(MO)  
P. HEATH WARD (SC)  
DANNY LEE WILLARD, JR. (SC)  
L. CRAYTON WILLIAMS (SC)

\*OF COUNSEL

December 18, 2018

The Honorable Jenny Abbot Kitchings  
South Carolina Court of Appeals  
Post Office Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211

RE: *Isabelle MacKenzie as Appellant/Respondent vs. C&B Logging, LLC and Charles  
Brandon Barr, as Respondents/Appellants*

*Case No.: 2016-CP-21-1831*

*Appellate No.: 2018-001016*


Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed please find the original and two copies of Appellant/Respondent's Initial Brief, Designation of Matter to Include in the Record on Appeal, and Proof of Service in the above-named case. We would appreciate it if you would file the original and return the clocked in copies to us.

By copy of this letter, I am serving the same on all counsel of record.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

  
J. Camden Hodge

**RECEIVED**

DEC 20 2018

SC Court of Appeals

Cc: John P. Riordan (via email and USPS)

**MAILING: 32 Ann Street, Charleston, South Carolina 29403**

**North Charleston:** 2170 Ashley Phosphate Road, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, North Charleston, South Carolina 29406 \* **Greenville:** 418 River Street, Greenville, SC 29601

**Florence:** 150 W. Evans Street, Florence, South Carolina 29501 \* **Myrtle Beach:** 2411 N. Oak Street, Suite 407, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29577

**Columbia:** 1201 Main Street, Suite 1100, Columbia, South Carolina 29201 \* **Raleigh, NC:** 8801 Fast Park Drive, Suite 301, Raleigh, NC 27617

**Wilmington, NC:** Appointment Only


Anastopoulo Law Firm  
32 Ann Street  
Charleston, SC 29403

**RECEIVED**

DEC 20 2018

**SC Court of Appeals**

The Honorable Jenny Abbot Kitchings  
South Carolina Court of Appeals  
Post Office Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211



US POSTAGE

\$02.68<sup>0</sup>

First-Class

Mailed From 29601

12/18/2018

032A 0061815875